



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,677	12/17/2001	Patrick Baudisch	D/A1188Q2	5086

7590

10/06/2003

Patent Documentation Center  
Xerox Corporation  
Xerox Square, 20th Floor  
100 Clinton Ave. S.  
Rochester, NY 14644

EXAMINER

BELL, PAUL A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2675

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/015,677

Applicant(s)

BAUDISCH ET AL.

Examiner

PAUL A BELL

Art Unit

2675

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "the n image" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim 6 or 1.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hogle, IV (5,923,307).

With regard to claim 1 Hogle teaches a method for displaying a perceived continuous image across first and second display areas, each display area having pixels of a given size and the pixel size of one display area is different than the pixel size of the other display area (With regard to mere "recitations" in preamble of claim see abstract, figures 3 and 4, items 41, 43 and C and further figures 9a and 9b teach a computer icon in "display properties window" getting larger when going from 1024X768 to 800X600 it is therefore inherent that the display "pixel" got larger) comprising: a) providing a first image to be displayed on the first display area (figure

4, items 41 and window C), b) providing a second image to be display on the second display area (figure 4, items 43 and window C) wherein the second image is a scaled portion of the first image such that when the images are displayed on the first and second display areas the resulting image appears substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the image (figure 4 and column 2, lines 1-13), and c) transmitting the first image to the first display area and the second image to the second display area (figure 3, items 330, 332 and 306).

With regard to claim 2 Hogle teaches that the method of claim 1 wherein the first and second images are provided in a computer readable file (figure 1, item 302).

With regard to claim 4 Hogle teaches a method for displaying a perceived continuous image across n display areas, each display area having pixels of a given size and the pixel size of at least one display area is different than the pixel size of at least one other display area (With regard to mere "recitations" in preamble of claim see abstract, figures 3 and 4, items 41, 43 and C and further figures 9a and 9b teach a computer icon in "display properties window" getting larger when going from 1024X768 to 800X600 it is therefore inherent that the display "pixel" got larger)comprising: a) providing a first image to be displayed on the first display area(figure 4, items 41 and window C), b) providing n images to be display on the n display areas wherein at least one of the n images is a scaled portion of the first image such that when the images are displayed on the n display areas the resulting image appears substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the image(figure 4, items 43 and window C), and c) transmitting the n images to the n display areas(figure 3, items 330, 332 and 306).

With regard to claim 5 Hogle teaches the method of claim 4 wherein the n images are provided in a computer readable file (figure 1, item 302).

Art Unit: 2675

With regard to claim 7 Hogle teaches a method for displaying a perceived continuous video image across first and second display areas, each display area having pixels of a given size and the pixel size of one display area is different than the pixel size of the other display area (With regard to mere "recitations" in preamble of claim see abstract, figures 3 and 4, items 41, 43 and C and further figures 9a and 9b teach a computer icon in "display properties window" getting larger when going from 1024X768 to 800X600 it is therefore inherent that the display "pixel" got larger)comprising: a) capturing a first video image to be displayed on the first display area (figure 4, items 41 and window C), b) capturing a second video image to be display on the second display area wherein the second image is a scaled portion of the first image such that when the images are displayed on the first and second display areas the resulting image appears substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the image (figure 4, items 43 and window C), and c) transmitting the first video image to the first display area and the second video image to the second display area (figure 3, items 330, 332 and 306).

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogle.

With regard to claim 3 Hogle does not teach the method of claim 1 wherein the first and second images are provided by a video camera or with regard to claim 6 the method of claim 1

Art Unit: 2675

wherein the n images are provided by a video camera. The recitation "images are provided by a video camera" are merely directed towards an "obvious intended use" of the Hogle invention because Hogle has image files and how they were produced is not critical to his invention and to use a digital camera to generate an image file would have been one of many obvious sources of data.

### Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Seidensticker, Jr. (5,920,327) teaches a visual conception only of a display exhibiting "fisheye" geometrical distortion (See figure 2). However his actual display item 18 every pixel is the same size as every other pixel and the transitions between different resolution regions are at best approximately continuous implemented by a series of discrete steps.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Bell whose telephone number is (703) 306-3019.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377 can help with any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or Faxed to: (703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)


Or Hand-delivered to: Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor  
(Receptionist).

*Paul Bell*

Paul Bell

Art unit 2675

September 29, 2003

  
STEVEN SARAS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600